



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,408	12/11/2003	David L. Kaminsky	014682.000002	1407

44870 7590 12/29/2008
MOORE & VAN ALLEN, PLLC For IBM
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

MADAMBA, GLENFORD J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2451

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/707,408	KAMINSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Glenford Madamba	2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-15, 18-25, 27-29, 31-38 and 40-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-15, 18-25, 27-29, 31-38, and 40-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to remarks filed by Applicant's representative on October 1, 2008.

Response to Remarks

2. With respect to Applicant's latest submission, the Office has given consideration to the remarks filed on October 1, 2008, but has deemed the arguments unpersuasive and/or insufficient to overcome the current rejection of the claims in view of the applied prior art reference(s) of the previous Office action, as will be discussed below.

With respect to the claims 1, 10, 23, 28 and 35, Applicant firstly argues that none of the cited references teach or disclose particular feature(s) of the claim, which recites in part: "determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification assigned to the policy template. The Office respectfully disagrees and submits that Applicant has misinterpreted and/or not fully considered all of the teachings and disclosures of the applied prior art reference(s).

In support of his argument, Applicant remarks that Shanumgam merely discloses that a 'policy' includes a *policy identifier* and that a central policy server monitors policy

Art Unit: 2451

enforcers that each have resources for managing policies of the network. As such, Applicant contends that Shanumgam et al. does not disclose or suggest a policy *template* being present at an enforcement point, nor does Shanumgam disclose or suggest receiving an 'identification' assigned to the policy template to determine if the policy template is present. The Office respectfully disagrees.

In response to the argument, the Office remarks and asserts that the above argued feature is in fact broadly disclosed by at least Menditto. For example, Menditto expressly discloses that "Content Gateway Policy Manager 26 is a 'management node'... that serves as a 'repository' for content policies and communicates with Content Gateways 18 to 'distribute' content policies with information service provider 12 and exchange policies with other content gateway policy managers in other information service providers [col 2,L45-52]. Menditto additionally discloses that Content Gateway 18 participates in a policy distribution network to *receive* and install content policies and supports content peering in order to direct requests to content gateways or content delivery nodes in other information service providers 12 [col 3, L21-25].

Further, in one embodiment, Menditto expressly teaches that "Content gateway directory 32 codifies a *policy* for content based routing. Content gateway directory 32 includes a classification policy and a processing policy. The *classification policy* defines the pattern or '*template*' used to match the domain name and additional

Art Unit: 2451

content of the request from client terminal 16.” [col 6, L41-46]. Significantly, Menditto also teaches the following:

Since valid domain name table 34 is relatively small and is not designed to hold every possible domain name that has an associated content policy for execution by a content gateway processor 30, there may be a content policy for a domain name within content gateway policy manager 26. In parallel, the domain name server query is also forwarded to content gateway policy manager 26 along path D. Content gateway policy manager 26 ‘determines’ if there is a content policy associated with the query. Content gateway policy manager 26 searches its policy database for policy_information. If no policy exists, then no action is taken. If a policy exists for the domain, the policy is provided to content gateway router 28 along path E.

[Menditto: col 9, L37-50]

Moreover, Menditto expressly discloses a ‘Policy ID’ for identifying a policy (Appendix A) [col 16] and a Classification Policy for defining ‘templates’ (Appendix A) [col 16] [col 6, L25-30] for the classification of URL requests. He also teaches that “a policy distribution point responsible for distributing policies to other network elements is connected to content gateway policy manager 26 and may send ‘policy updates’ to other content gateways 18 and content gateway managers 26 as appropriate [col 7, L9-13].

Given the above disclosures and features, it is thus clear that Menditto’s invention expressly teaches a Policy Manager providing / distributing ‘policies’ and/or

Art Unit: 2451

'policy updates' to a content gateway router 28 or peer device (that does not yet have the particular policy or update in its policy database), in response to a query. It is also thus clear that the 'existing policy' or 'policy update' to be provided / distributed (e.g., Classification Policy that defines a 'template', or Processing Policy) can be identified using the 'Policy ID' feature of Menditto's invention. The argued feature of "determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification assigned to the policy template" is thus expressly taught by at least Menditto.

With regards to the argued feature, the Office secondly remarks and notes that, assuming any deficiencies in the disclosures of Menditto (which there are none), the argued feature of "determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification assigned to the policy template" is also obvious and well-known in the art. In this regard, the Office submits as supporting evidence related inventions according to Lortz, (US Patent 6,957,261) and Bakshi et al. (US Patent 7,441,263), which alternatively teaches and discloses the argued feature of distributing and/or providing 'policy' / 'multi-policy templates' to devices that do not yet have the particular 'policy or 'policy template', and that are identified by a Policy identifier or ID. Applicant is thus invited to review the well-known teachings and disclosures of the above noted references, cited but not referred to in this Office Action.

Further, with respect to the claims 1, 10, 23, 28 and 35, Applicant secondly argues that none of the cited references teach or disclose “the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately”. The Office respectfully disagrees.

In response to the argument, the Office reiterates that the above argued feature is expressly taught or disclosed in view of Applicant’s own admitted prior art teachings. As noted in the previous Office action / rejection, the argued feature“ is well-known in the art and expressly disclosed in view of Applicant’s Admitted own Prior Art.

With respect to Applicant’s background for his own invention, Applicant states the following:

“Policies may be defined or developed to control software applications, network management, e-commerce or business or similar communications or data processing activities. Such policies may include ‘if-then’ clauses or similar statements or definitions. An example of one policy may be “if some precondition, then perform some predefined action, or set some value or the like.” In another example, the policy may be “if some precondition and some other precondition or preconditions, then perform some predefined action, set some value or the like.” Policies can have a typical lifecycle. Over time, policies may be updated to meet changing conditions or needs or may become outdated and deleted or changed to new policies. Efficiently defining, storing, ‘distributing’

and enforcing policies can be a challenge. Under some circumstances only minor changes or selected parameters or values used in a policy or related group of policies may need to be changed. Defining an entirely new policy or policies, distributing the policies to all enforcement points and making adjustments at each of the enforcement points to implement and enforce the policies may be burdensome, time consuming and involve inefficient use of limited data processing, storage and communication resources." [Application Background of the Invention: 0002]

Accordingly, the argued feature of "the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately" is obvious and well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art. Alternatively, at least Shanumgam expressly teaches that 'changes' or 'updates' to policy and/or 'policy settings' made at the central policy server are automatically transferred to the policy enforcers for updating their respective databases [Shanumgam: Abstract] [col 20, L22-47] [col 21, L5-10]. The argued feature is thus also taught or disclosed by Shanumgam.

Lastly, with regards to the claims, Applicant argues that none of the references disclose or suggest "transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository, where policy templates are stored, in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes the ID assigned to the policy

Art Unit: 2451

template". However, it has been established previously above that Menditto teaches these features, and the argued feature is thus fully disclosed by at least Menditto.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 3, 11 - 15, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 36 -38 and 40, the Office notes that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 10, 23, 28, 35, and inherits all of the features of their respective parent claim. The rejection of the claims is accordingly maintained for at least the same reasons provided for the rejection of the independent claims.

Additionally, regarding dependent claims 6-9, 18-22, 32-34, and 4-44, the Office notes that these claims are also dependent on one of 1, 10, 28 and 35 and, therefore, are not patentable for at least for the same reasons provided for the rejection of their respective parent independent claims.

\

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1- 3, 10-15, 23-25, 27-29, 31, 35-38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam et al (hereinafter Shanumgam), U.S. Patent US 7,032,022 B1 in view of Menditto et al (hereinafter Menditto), U.S. Patent 6,981,029 and in further view of Applicant's Admitted own Prior Art (AAPA).

As per Claims 1, 11, 12, 23, 24 and 36, Shanumgam in view of Menditto discloses a method to distribute policies, comprising [Abstract]:

determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point (Policy Enforcers 142 / 126) [Fig. 1] [col 1, L65 – col 2, L26] in response to receiving an identification (ID) (i.e., Policy Identifier {ID}) [col 10, L53] assigned to the policy template at the enforcement point; (Menditto: [col 3, L1-29] [col 6, L16-53] [col 9, L37-62] [col 12, L20 –col 13, L6]) wherein the policy template includes a form of "if a first parameter then a second parameter", the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources;

transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository, where policy templates are stored, in response to the policy template not being present at the

Art Unit: 2451

enforcement point, wherein the query includes the ID assigned to the policy template;

(Menditto: [col 3, L1-29] [col 6, L16-53] [col 9, L37-62] [col 12, L20 –col 13, L6])

receiving the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the policy template is transmitted by the repository in response to the query; (Menditto: [col 3, L1-29] [col 6, L16-53] [col 9, L37-62] [col 12, L20 –col 13, L6])and

receiving a set of parameters (i.e., attributes) [col 19, L49-65] to be used in the policy template (e.g., selected policy enforcer 'settings') [Abstract] [Fig. 5] [col 8, L20-54] at the enforcement point (i.e., 411) [Fig. 5] [Figs. 1-4, 13-14 & 17] [col 1, L65 – col 2, L26] wherein the set of parameters are transmitted separately from the policy template.

While Shanumgam discloses substantial features of the invention, such as Policy Server Database 130, Policy Enforcement Points 124 / 126, Policy Settings for the Policy Enforcers, and Policy Identifier (ID) Attribute 724 for identifying a particular policy rule in the list of policies, and a method of distributing / replicating the 'policies' (including their Policy ID) from Policy Server to Policy Enforcers 124 / 126, the additionally recited features of the method comprising the steps of determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification (ID) assigned to the policy template at the enforcement point; transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository, where policy templates are stored, in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes the ID assigned to the policy template; and receiving the policy

Art Unit: 2451

template at the enforcement point, wherein the policy template is transmitted by the repository in response to the query are disclosed by Menditto in a related endeavor.

Menditto discloses as his invention an information service provider network that includes a content gateway to process requests for information from a client terminal. The content gateway includes a router for receiving a request for information from the client terminal. The router forwards the request according to the domain name to a selected one of a plurality of processors to further process the request. The selected one of the plurality of processors identifies an information source to satisfy the request in response to the additional content of the request [Abstract] [col 1, L45-53] [Figs. 1 & 3]. As part of his invention, Menditto discloses that “Content Gateways 18 distribute information from content providers 14 either directly or through content delivery nodes 22 to client terminals 16 according to Content Gateway Policy Manager 26 (CGPM). CGPM 26 is a management node in information service provider 12 that serves as a repository for content policies and communicates with content gateways 18 to distribute content policies within information service provider 12 and exchange policies with other CGPMs in other information service providers” [col 2, L43-53].

In particular, Menditto discloses the additionally recited features of the method comprising the steps of determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification (ID) assigned to the policy template at the enforcement point; transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository, where policy templates are stored, in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes the ID assigned to the policy

Art Unit: 2451

template; and receiving the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the policy template is transmitted by the repository in response to the query [col 3, L1-29][col 6, L16-53] (e.g., "...content policy may be *downloaded* to content gateway 18 *on-demand*....") [col 7, L1-53] [col 8, L27-30] (e.g., ...content policy associated with a query...receiving policy updates from CGPM 26 and processing subsequent requests according to the newly installed policy.) [col 9, L37-62] [col 12, L20 –col 13, L6].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine and/or modify Shanumgam's invention with the above said additionally recited features, as disclosed by Menditto for the motivation of providing systems and method for processing a request for information in a network that has considerable advantages over conventional routing techniques (e.g. determining a source of information based on the additional content of a request apart from the domain name associated therewith) [col 1, L54 – col 2, L2].

Further, while the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto discloses substantial features of the invention, as above, the additional recited feature of wherein the policy template includes a form of "if a first parameter then a second parameter", the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the

Art Unit: 2451

entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources is well-known and expressly disclosed in view of Applicant's Admitted own Prior Art.

With respect to Applicant's background for his own invention, Applicant states the following:

"Policies may be defined or developed to control software applications, network management, e-commerce or business or similar communications or data processing activities. Such policies may include 'if-then' clauses or similar statements or definitions. An example of one policy may be "if some precondition, then perform some predefined action, or set some value or the like." In another example, the policy may be "if some precondition and some other precondition or preconditions, then perform some predefined action, set some value or the like." Policies can have a typical lifecycle. Over time, policies may be updated to meet changing conditions or needs or may become outdated and deleted or changed to new policies. Efficiently defining, storing, distributing and enforcing policies can be a challenge. Under some circumstances only minor changes or selected parameters or values used in a policy or related group of policies may need to be changed. Defining an entirely new policy or policies, distributing the policies to all enforcement points and making adjustments at each of the enforcement points to implement and enforce the policies may be burdensome, time consuming and involve inefficient use of limited data

processing, storage and communication resources.” [Application Background of the Invention: 0002]

It would thus be obvious to combine and/or modify the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto with the above well-known feature as disclosed by Applicant for the motivation of efficiently providing ‘updates’ to policies and/or policy templates that defined the policies, including policy parameters that comprise the policy / policy templates.

Claims 11, 12, 23, 24 and 36 recite the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by statutory category, and thus rejected on the same basis.

As per Claims 2, 13, 29 and 37, Shanumgam discloses the method of claim 1, binding the parameters to the policy template [Abstract] [Figs. 5 & 17] [col 20, L22-47].

As per Claims 3, 14 and 38, Shanumgam discloses the method of claim 2, further comprising implementing the policy associated with the policy template [Figs. 1-5, 15 & 17] [col 1, L65 – col 2, L26].

As per Claim 15, Shanumgam discloses the method of claim 11, further comprising storing each one of the at least one set of parameters by name and type [col 13, L24-

Art Unit: 2451

30].

As per Claims 31 and 40, Shanumgam discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising transmitting any policy templates to the enforcement point or any of the selected enforcement points in response to a query from the enforcement point or any of the selected enforcement points including any IDs assigned to the policy templates.

As per Claims 10, 28 and 35, Shanumgam in view of Menditto discloses a method to distribute policies, comprising:

defining a policy template associated with each policy; assigning a unique identification (ID) to each policy template [Abstract]; wherein the policy template includes a form of "if a first parameter then a second parameter", the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources;

storing each policy template and assigned ID (130) [Fig. 1]; and

transmitting only the assigned ID to an enforcement point for each policy to be enforced by the enforcement point, wherein only the ID is transmitted to the enforcement point rather than the policy template to substantially minimize use of data

Art Unit: 2451

processing and communication resources (i.e., 411) [Fig. 5] [Figs. 1-4, 13-14 & 17] [col 1, L65 – col 2, L26];

determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point (Policy Enforcers 142 / 126) [Fig. 1] [col 1, L65 – col 2, L26] in response to receiving an identification (ID) (i.e., Policy Identifier {ID}) [col 10, L53] assigned to the policy template at the enforcement point; (Menditto: [col 3, L1-29] [col 6, L16-53] [col 9, L37-62] [col 12, L20 –col 13, L6])

transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository, where policy templates are stored, in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes the ID assigned to the policy template; (Menditto: [col 3, L1-29] [col 6, L16-53] [col 9, L37-62] [col 12, L20 –col 13, L6])

receiving the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the policy template is transmitted by the repository in response to the query; (Menditto: [col 3, L1-29] [col 6, L16-53] [col 9, L37-62] [col 12, L20 –col 13, L6]) and

receiving a set of parameters (i.e., attributes) [col 19, L49-65] to be used in the policy template (e.g., selected policy enforcer 'settings') [Abstract] [Fig. 5] [col 8, L20-54] at the enforcement point (i.e., 411) [Fig. 5] [Figs. 1-4, 13-14 & 17] [col 1, L65 – col 2, L26].

While Shanumgam discloses substantial features of the invention, such as Policy Server Database 130, Policy Enforcement Points 124 / 126, Policy Settings for the

Art Unit: 2451

Policy Enforcers, and Policy Identifier (ID) Attribute 724 for identifying a particular policy rule in the list of policies, and a method of distributing / replicating the 'policies' (including their Policy ID) from Policy Server to Policy Enforcers 124 / 126, the additionally recited features of the method comprising the steps of determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification (ID) assigned to the policy template at the enforcement point; transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository, where policy templates are stored, in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes the ID assigned to the policy template; and receiving the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the policy template is transmitted by the repository in response to the query are disclosed by Menditto in a related endeavor.

Menditto discloses as his invention an information service provider network that includes a content gateway to process requests for information from a client terminal. The content gateway includes a router for receiving a request for information from the client terminal. The router forwards the request according to the domain name to a selected one of a plurality of processors to further process the request. The selected one of the plurality of processors identifies an information source to satisfy the request in response to the additional content of the request [Abstract] [col 1, L45-53] [Figs. 1 & 3]. As part of his invention, Menditto discloses that "Content Gateways 18 distribute information from content providers 14 either directly or through content delivery nodes 22 to client terminals 16 according to Content Gateway Policy Manager 26 (CGPM). CGPM 26 is a management node in information service provider 12 that serves as a

Art Unit: 2451

repository for content policies and communicates with content gateways 18 to distribute content policies within information service provider 12 and exchange policies with other CGPMs in other information service providers” [col 2, L43-53].

In particular, Menditto discloses the additionally recited features of the method comprising the steps of determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification (ID) assigned to the policy template at the enforcement point; transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository, where policy templates are stored, in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes the ID assigned to the policy template; and receiving the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the policy template is transmitted by the repository in response to the query [col 3, L1-29][col 6, L16-53] (e.g., “...content policy may be *downloaded* to content gateway 18 *on-demand*...” [col 7, L1-53] [col 8, L27-30] (e.g., ...content policy associated with a query...receiving policy updates from CGPM 26 and processing subsequent requests according to the newly installed policy.) [col 9, L37-62] [col 12, L20 –col 13, L6].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine and/or modify Shanumgam’s invention with the above said additionally recited features, as disclosed by Menditto for the motivation of providing systems and method for processing a request for information in a network that has considerable advantages over conventional routing techniques (e.g. determining a source of information based on the additional content of a request apart from the domain name associated therewith) [col 1, L54 – col 2, L2].

Further, while the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto discloses substantial features of the invention, as above, the additional recited feature of wherein the policy template includes a form of "if a first parameter then a second parameter", the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources is well-known and expressly disclosed in view of Applicant's Admitted own Prior Art.

With respect to Applicant's background for his own invention, Applicant states the following:

"Policies may be defined or developed to control software applications, network management, e-commerce or business or similar communications or data processing activities. Such policies may include 'if-then' clauses or similar statements or definitions. An example of one policy may be "if some precondition, then perform some predefined action, or set some value or the like." In another example, the policy may be "if some precondition and some other precondition or preconditions, then perform some predefined action, set some value or the like." Policies can have a typical lifecycle. Over time, policies may be updated to meet changing conditions or needs or may become outdated and deleted or changed to new policies. Efficiently defining, storing, distributing

Art Unit: 2451

and enforcing policies can be a challenge. Under some circumstances only minor changes or selected parameters or values used in a policy or related group of policies may need to be changed. Defining an entirely new policy or policies, distributing the policies to all enforcement points and making adjustments at each of the enforcement points to implement and enforce the policies may be burdensome, time consuming and involve inefficient use of limited data processing, storage and communication resources.” [Application Background of the Invention: 0002]

It would thus be obvious to combine and/or modify the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto with the above well-known feature as disclosed by Applicant for the motivation of efficiently providing ‘updates’ to policies and/or policy templates that defined the policies, including policy parameters that comprise the policy / policy templates.

As per Claim 25, Shanumgam discloses the system of claim 23, wherein each enforcement point comprises:

a processor to receive the IDs assigned to each policy template (policy server 122 / policy enforcers 124 / 126) [Fig. 1]; and

a data source to store each policy template for enforcement and assigned ID, wherein the processor forms and transmits a query in response to each policy template

Art Unit: 2451

corresponding to any transmitted IDs not present in the data source (e.g., repositories 130, 132, 134) [Fig. 1] [Figs. 3-4 & 12-19]

As per Claim 27, Shanumgam discloses the system of claim 26, further comprising a server to interface between each policy administrator, each enforcement point and the repository [Fig. 1].

3. Claims 6, 18, 32 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam et al (hereinafter Shanumgam), U.S. Patent US 7,032,022 B1 in view of Menditto et al (hereinafter Menditto), U.S. Patent 6,981,029 and in further view of Widegren et al (hereinafter Widegren), U.S. Patent 6,621,793.

As per Claims 6, 18, 32 and 41, Shanumgam in view of Menditto and in further view of Widegren discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising applying asynchronous, out-of-band communication to transmit the query and any policy templates.

While the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto discloses substantial features of the invention such as the method of claim 5, and transmitting of policy templates in response to a query from the enforcement points, the added feature of the method further comprising applying asynchronous, out-of-band communication to

Art Unit: 2451

transmit the query and any policy templates is disclosed by Widegren in a related endeavor.

Widegren discloses as his invention a method of filtering and gating data flow in a QoS connection between a remote host and user equipment in a packet data network using policy control mechanisms includes a remote host initiating an application in an application server and a corresponding session between the remote host and the user equipment ("UE") via the application server. The UE requests, to a gateway support node ("GGSN") of the network, establishment of a network bearer service between the UE and the remote host. A corresponding policy control function ("PCF") in a policy server receives, from the application server, filtering data derived from session data received by the application server during the session. The GGSN interrogates the corresponding PCF in the policy server to initialize a gate using policy control filtering data at the GGSN. The gate then filters the data flow in the QoS connection according to the policy control filtering data [Abstract]. In particular, Widegren discloses the added feature of the method further comprising applying asynchronous, out-of-band communication to transmit the query and any policy templates (e.g., asynchronous notification) [col 22, L41-53].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto's invention with the added feature of the method further comprising applying asynchronous, out-of-band communication to transmit the query and any policy templates, as disclosed by

Art Unit: 2451

Widegren, for the motivation of providing a method of filtering and gating data in packet data networks using policy mechanisms [col 1, L15-17].

4. Claims 7, 19, 20, 33 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam et al (hereinafter Shanumgam), U.S. Patent US 7,032,022 B1 in view of Menditto et al (hereinafter Menditto), U.S. Patent 6,981,029 and in further view of and in further view of Danieli, U.S. Patent 6,510,513.

As per Claims 7, 19, 20, 33 and 42, Shanumgam view of Menditto and in further view of Danieli discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising compressing each policy template before transmitting to the enforcement point or any of the selected enforcement points.

While the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto discloses substantial features of the invention such as the method of claim 5, and transmitting of policy templates in response to a query from the enforcement points, the added feature of the method further comprising compressing each policy template before transmitting to the enforcement point or any of the selected enforcement points is disclosed by Danieli in a related endeavor.

Danieli discloses as his invention a Security services and policy enforcement for electronic data. A first client generates a digest from the electronic data, and submits a

Art Unit: 2451

security certificate request containing the digest to a trusted arbitrator server, where the request is time stamped and logged. The trusted arbitrator authenticates the first client's credentials and returns the security certificate to the first client. The data and security certificate are combined to create a distribution unit. A second client acquires the distribution unit, extracts the security certificate, and generates a digest from the data. If the digest from the second client matches the logged digest from the first client, the data is valid. Depending on the certificate type and policy level, the trusted arbitrator server provides other services to the clients, such as notification of improper user of the data [Abstract]. In particular, Danieli discloses the added feature of the method further comprising compressing each policy template before transmitting to the enforcement point or any of the selected enforcement points [col 16, L21-36].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto's invention with the added feature of the method further comprising compressing each policy template before transmitting to the enforcement point or any of the selected enforcement points, as disclosed by Danieli, for the motivation of providing a system and method for authenticating and validating electronic data and enforcing restrictions (e.g. policies) on the use of electronic data [col 1, L5-10].

5. Claims 8, 9, 21, 22, 34, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam et al (hereinafter Shanumgam), U.S. Patent US 7,032,022 B1 in view of Menditto et al (hereinafter Menditto), U.S. Patent 6,981,029 and

Art Unit: 2451

in further view of Valente et al (hereinafter Valente), U.S. Patent Publication US 2003/0110192 A1.

As per Claims 8, 21, 34 and 43, Shanumgam in view of Menditto and in further view of Valente discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising forming the policy template in a structured document.

While the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto discloses substantial features of the invention such as the method of claim 1, and transmitting of policy templates in response to a query from the enforcement points, the added feature of the method further comprising forming each policy template in a structured document (e.g., XML document) is disclosed by Valente in a related endeavor.

Valente discloses as his invention a Security services and policy enforcement for electronic data. A first client generates a digest from the electronic data, and submits a security certificate request containing the digest to a trusted arbitrator server, where the request is time stamped and logged. The trusted arbitrator authenticates the first client's credentials and returns the security certificate to the first client. The data and security certificate are combined to create a distribution unit. A second client acquires the distribution unit, extracts the security certificate, and generates a digest from the data. If the digest from the second client matches the logged digest from the first client, the data is valid. Depending on the certificate type and policy level, the trusted arbitrator server provides other services to the clients, such as notification of improper

Art Unit: 2451

user of the data [Abstract]. In particular, Valente discloses the added feature of the method further comprising forming each policy template in a structured document [Abstract] (e.g., XML file 602a) [Fig. 6].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto's invention with the added feature of the method further comprising forming each policy template in a structured document (e.g., XML document), as disclosed by Valente, for the motivation of providing a system and method for authenticating and validating electronic data and enforcing restrictions (e.g. policies) on the use of electronic data [col 1, L5-10].

As per Claims 9, 22 and 44, Shanumgam in view of Menditto and in further view of Valente discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising forming the policy template in a mark-up language.

While the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto discloses substantial features of the invention such as the method of claim 5, and transmitting of policy templates in response to a query from the enforcement points, the added feature of the method further comprising forming each policy template in a mark-up language is disclosed by Valente in a related endeavor.

Valente discloses as his invention a Security services and policy enforcement for electronic data. A first client generates a digest from the electronic data, and submits a security certificate request containing the digest to a trusted arbitrator server, where

Art Unit: 2451

the request is time stamped and logged. The trusted arbitrator authenticates the first client's credentials and returns the security certificate to the first client. The data and security certificate are combined to create a distribution unit. A second client acquires the distribution unit, extracts the security certificate, and generates a digest from the data. If the digest from the second client matches the logged digest from the first client, the data is valid. Depending on the certificate type and policy level, the trusted arbitrator server provides other services to the clients, such as notification of improper user of the data [Abstract]. In particular, Valente discloses the added feature of the method further comprising forming each policy template in a mark-up language [Abstract] (e.g., XML file 602a) [Fig. 6].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Shanumgam and Menditto's invention with the added feature of the method further comprising forming each policy template in a structured document (e.g., XML document), as disclosed by Valente, for the motivation of providing a system and method for authenticating and validating electronic data and enforcing restrictions (e.g. policies) on the use of electronic data [col 1, L5-10].

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenford Madamba whose telephone number is 571-272-7989. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Wallace Martin can be reached on 571-272-3440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2451

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451

Glenford Madamba
Examiner
Art Unit 2451